

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,897	06/25/2001	William L. Elderson	010214	9340
26285	7590 09/10/2002			
KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP			EXAMINER	
	FIELD STREET GH, PA 15222		HORTON, YVONNE MICHELE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3635	
			DATE MAILED: 09/10/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/888,897

Applicant(s)

WILLIAM L. ELDERSON

Examiner

YVONNE M. HORTON

Art Unit 3635



Davidd f		on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
A SHO	for Reply ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	·		
mailing	date of this communication.	no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the		
- If the po - If NO po - Failure t - Any rep	period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within th	and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. he application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 25, 2			
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b) 💢 This act	ion is non-final.		
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance e closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pair	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is rrte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.		
	tion of Claims			
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-44</u>	is/are pending in the application.		
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.		
	Claim(s)			
	Claim(s)			
		are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
	tion Papers			
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) \square accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the di	lrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.		
_	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply t	to this Office action.		
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin	ner.		
	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pr	flority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
	All b)□ Some* c)□ None of:			
_	1. U Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.			
	2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do application from the International Burea ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	ocuments have been received in this National Stage au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic			
a) 🗌	-			
15) 🗌 .	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic			
Attachme				
_	tice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).		
	ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
3) L Info	ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	6) Other:		

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-32, 33-37 and 42-43 drawn to a stud bridging system, wall arrangement and method of constructing, classified in class 52, subclass 712 and class 52, subclass 667.
 - II. Claims 38-41, drawn to a door jamb, classified in class 52, subclass 204.1.
 - III. Claim 44, drawn to a method of constructing a window jamb, classified in class52, subclass 745.16.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions of Groups I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions of the door jamb does not require the particulars of the stud bridging system.
- 3. Inventions of Groups II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions the door jamb does not require the particulars of the method of constructing a window.

-

4. Inventions Groups I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that

Page 3

they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation,

different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the

different inventions the stud bridging system does not require the particulars of the method of

constructing a window jamb.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a

separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for

examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. Should the applicant elect the stud bridging system and wall of Group I, he must further

elect a specific stud and wall assembly associated therewith because this application contains

claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species of wall and stud bridgers as shown in Figs 1-7; Figs 8-10; and Figs 21-23.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for

prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held

to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the

species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable

thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that

all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Art Unit: 3635

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of

claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the

limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after

the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP §

809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct,

applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to

be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the

examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission

may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Yvonne M. Horton whose telephone number is (703) 308-1909.

VMI

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3635

September 9, 2002